

**FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF  
THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON  
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND  
CULTURAL AFFAIRS**

---

**LETTER**

**FROM**

**THE CHAIRMAN, THE U.S. ADVISORY  
COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL  
EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS**

**TRANSMITTING**

**THE FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION,  
PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 87-256**



**FEBRUARY 8, 1968.—Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs  
and ordered to be printed**

---

**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE**

**89-566 O**

**WASHINGTON : 1968**



## LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

---

THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON  
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS,  
*Washington, D.C., February 6, 1968.*

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with section 107 of Public Law 87-256, I submit herewith the Fifth Annual Report of the Advisory Commission.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH R. SMILEY, *Chairman.*

(III)



FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT  
OF THE  
UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON  
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

July 1, 1966 - June 30, 1967

Washington, D. C.

THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON  
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Joseph R. Smiley, Chairman  
President, University of Colorado

Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., Vice Chairman  
President, University of Connecticut

Walter Adams  
Professor of Economics  
Michigan State University

Luther H. Foster  
President, Tuskegee Institute

Rufus C. Harris  
President, Mercer University

Arnold M. Picker  
Chairman, Executive Committee  
United Artists Corporation

Abram Sachar  
President, Brandeis University

Robert A. Scalapino  
Professor of Political Science  
University of California, Berkeley

Miss Pauline Tompkins  
President, Cedar Crest College

---

James A. Donovan, jr., Staff Director

**FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT  
of the U. S. Advisory Commission  
on International Educational and Cultural Affairs**

**INTRODUCTION**

"To provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges."

These words introduce the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 - better known as the Fulbright-Hays Act. This act established the U. S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, whose purpose is to "formulate and recommend to the President policies for exercising his authority under this Act and...appraise the effectiveness of programs carried out pursuant to it." The act states that the Commission "shall submit annual reports to the Congress and such other reports...as they deem appropriate, and shall make reports to the public in the United States and abroad to develop a better understanding of and support for the programs authorized by this Act."

In this, the Commission's fifth annual report, we shall trace the feelings of optimism in the world of education which developed with the passage of the Fulbright-Hays Act and were stimulated by the President's distinguished Smithsonian address in September 1965, his message to the Congress on international education the following February, and the signing of the International Education Act of 1966.

Unfortunately, however, the Commission must report that the enthusiasm which was stirred by this new stress on education with an international emphasis has now given way to frustration and confusion arising from what can only be called a damaging crisis in public and private funding.

#### SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

At this time, as fiscal year 1967 is concluded, the Commission offers the following recommendations, which will be more fully developed later in this report:

...In order to maintain the integrity of the educational and cultural exchange programs of the U. S. Government, the Commission urges the establishment of a separate public-private entity to assume complete responsibility for these programs, which are now handled by several Government agencies. The Katzenbach panel, appointed by the President last spring to consider the effects of the revelations of CIA support of certain educational and cultural organizations, made a similar recommendation, but we would go much farther down that road. (See appendix 5.)

...Unless and until the recommendation stated above is acted upon, the Commission urges the executive branch and the Congress to increase the budget of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State.



...The Commission calls upon the Congress to appropriate funds to put into effect the International Education Act of 1966.

...The Commission calls upon the Congress to reconsider its position on the establishment of a corps of Education Officers.

#### DEVELOPMENTS OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS

##### High Hopes

On April 5, 1962, the day of its first meeting, the Commission was received by President Kennedy at the White House in the presence of Senators Fulbright, Mundt, and Magnuson and Representatives Hays, Rooney, and McDowell, and others. They had been welcomed in the Department by Secretary of State Rusk earlier in the day. There was a general air of optimism about international educational and cultural exchange programs at that time.

The Fulbright-Hays Act--reaffirming the principles underlying the exchange program and amplifying the authorizations for the future--was only a little more than 6 months old. It had been passed by bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress. The State Department's budget for educational and cultural exchange appeared to be on a slowly but perceptibly rising curve. The Peace Corps, then just 13 months old, was receiving much favorable attention, both at home and abroad. AID's Technical Assistance Program was already large and increasing in size. In short, the Commission had justifiably great hopes for the future expansion and increasing effectiveness of these and related programs.

Representative Hays had told the Commission he thought the legislation was sufficiently broad for the Department to do almost anything it wished in the field of international educational and cultural exchange. There seemed to be no lack of legislative authority for the orderly and imaginative development of these programs as a major new component in our foreign relations.

The Commission here emphasizes this wide latitude of authority provided by the Fulbright-Hays Act, particularly in light of the revelations in the spring of 1967 of the involvement of the Central Intelligence Agency in the support of certain non-governmental organizations conducting international educational and cultural programs. We must point out that this broad and far-sighted legislation would have enabled the Government to do overtly many of the things which we know now the Central Intelligence Agency was doing covertly.

In the summer of 1964 the first chairman of the Commission, Dr. John W. Gardner, resigned to head the President's Task Force on Education. Though this was a loss to the Commission, Dr. Gardner's new efforts helped to achieve the greatest commitments to education that the nation had ever witnessed. President Johnson asked for and the Congress granted more funds for education in the United States than had been granted any previous administration in its history.

In the summer of 1965 Dr. Gardner was appointed Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Dr. Homer D. Babidge, Jr.,

President of the University of Connecticut and former Assistant Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was appointed to succeed Dr. Gardner as chairman of the Advisory Commission. Shortly thereafter Dr. Charles Frankel assumed the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. He came to this post from long academic experience at Columbia University, and from study and travel overseas under international education grants from the Fulbright Program and several private foundations.

There is no question that these new appointments resulted in a revitalized interest on the part of the educational community. Throughout the nation educators gave their support to the new directions being formulated for the extension of international educational programs.

#### President Johnson's Proposals

In the fall of 1965 President Johnson, in a major address before scholars from 80 nations at the Smithsonian Institution, proposed a broad new program for strengthening international studies on American campuses, for enlarging our educational activities domestically and overseas, and for heightening the levels and dimensions of education throughout the world. In his Smithsonian address the President referred to the new effort as a "new and noble adventure."

In February 1966 President Johnson made specific recommendations in a message to Congress in which he urged passage of the International Education Act of 1966. The President proposed:

- to strengthen our capacity for international educational cooperation.
- to stimulate exchange with students and teachers of other lands.
- to assist the progress of education in developing nations.
- to build new bridges of international understanding.

Under the above general headings were these recommendations:

- A Center for Educational Cooperation was to be established to be a focal point for leadership in international education.
- A Council on International Education was to be appointed from among outstanding leaders to advise the Center for Educational Cooperation.
- A corps of Education Officers was to be created to serve as education's representatives in our embassies abroad.
- There were to be new programs in international studies in elementary and secondary schools.
- Smaller and developing colleges were to be encouraged to develop programs of international scope through incentive grants.
- Centers of special competence in international research and training were to be strengthened.
- An "Exchange Peace Corps" was to be established.

### Hopes Unrealized

These bold new initiatives - and many others not listed here -- were to be undertaken through cooperative action by the Department of State, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Peace Corps, Agency for International Development, Department of Defense, and the United States Information Agency.

Most of these programs have not materialized. The Center for Educational Cooperation has not been established; the Council has not been appointed; there are no Education Officers serving in key embassies overseas; none of the proposed new programs in international studies have been developed in elementary and secondary schools; no incentive grants have been made to the smaller colleges.

The President had proposed an Exchange Peace Corps with an initial goal of 5,000 persons. There are at present just 64 Volunteers to America - a pilot program financed from the diminishing budget of the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Why has so little happened? The Congress passed the International Education Act in October 1966, but it has not yet appropriated any funds to carry out the programs. The rising hopes of a committed and concerned academic community have been deflated by the inaction of Congress.

This Commission, to fulfill its obligations to the Congress, to the Administration, and to the public at large, must record the gravity of the current situation. We feel obligated to report

to the Congress that disappointment throughout the academic community is great. Many institutions have intended to establish offices of international programs, but plans have remained on the drawing boards pending congressional action. Many of the major foundations have been withholding funds from institutions pending the outcome of congressional appropriations for international educational programs.

#### Funding Crisis

Education and World Affairs, a private, nonprofit educational organization, made a public policy statement on this crisis in July 1967. In this statement the members of its board of trustees declared:

"Research and training in international affairs are essential in the national interest. Yet international studies in U. S. universities and colleges face an uncertain future. A situation has developed which may deprive our higher educational institutions of the funds they require to sustain their current programs and to build new ones....

"Specifically, our concern is that federal funds intended by the International Education Act of 1966 will not be appropriated soon enough and in adequate enough measure to prevent a period of financial stringency for international studies. The danger we face from this funding crisis is that we will lose

momentum, that the leadership which the United States now enjoys in the fields and disciplines making up international studies will be undermined.

"...With the foundations awaiting clarification of the federal government's role, and with the Congress not yet having made any appropriations under the IEA, the universities and colleges face the prospect of a grave shortage of funds for international training and research.

"...Unless our nation can change the course it is now on and avoid the impending crisis in funding, the outcome is certain: five years from now we will suffer the consequences of our present failure to grasp the realities and the dynamics of international studies in the universities and colleges of the United States."

This is not the first of our reports in which we have pointed to the rising needs and opportunities in this field and the diminishing resources being made available by Government. Despite rising needs and opportunities, the budget of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the State Department has been declining over the last two fiscal years. The appropriation for fiscal year 1966 reached a level of \$53 million. Ironically, the following year, immediately after the President had made his new international education proposals, the appropriation for the Bureau fell to

\$47 million. For the current fiscal year-1968-the appropriation is further reduced to \$46 million.' The appropriation request sent to the Congress by the Bureau was also below that of previous years because of a limitation placed by the Bureau of the Budget as a result of the President's directive to cut expenses.

We believe that such deep reductions in programs already financed at minimal levels - as we have said before - do not represent true economy. They only delay the strengthening of our foreign relations by delaying the strengthening of the total framework in which nations can find peace and stability.

As the Commission looks back over the last 5 years, we find considerable irony in the history of international educational and cultural exchange programs. In passing the Fulbright-Hays Act, the Congress required the Commission to make a special report appraising the Department's educational exchange programs. This we did at length, on the basis of a professional research survey, published in 1963 under the title A Beacon of Hope. As a result of this thorough and dispassionate appraisal we were convinced, and remain so, of the unique utility of these programs.

Success of these programs, strangely enough, did not breed commensurate success in the levels of financial support for them. That the Department's budget should have decreased, in view of the established and well-known success of these programs, appears to us an irony without humor--an irony in which we see, at the



very least, costly delays in realizing the potentials these programs offer. Other agencies - the Peace Corps, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Agency for International Development - have their specialized programs of exchanges, but the Department of State's programs are central and basic to the total national effort to promote international understanding.

We would, therefore, recommend to the executive and the legislative branches the urgent need to reverse the downward trend in budgets, to move against the tide of retrenchment in this area where advantages are so plainly evident at such relatively low costs.

We would not undertake to recommend the amount of current funding either the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs or the International Education Act should have. We say only that the amounts should be sufficient to give clear notice that no backward trend or standstill status any longer prevails, and that the forward movement of more than two decades in this general field is emphatically being resumed.

#### Punta del Este

The President's commitment to education and science at the Summit Meeting of American Presidents at Punta del Este marked a new stage in the Alliance for Progress. The Bureau's early participation in the Government-wide preparations for the meeting is reflected in the Declaration of the Presidents of

America, April 14, 1967, which affirms that the Presidents will "vigorously promote education for development...and harness science and technology for the service of our peoples."

In support of these objectives the Presidents declared, among other things, that:

"...Educational systems will be modernized taking full advantage of educational innovations, and exchanges of teachers and students will be increased.

"...multinational institutes for advanced training and research will be established; existing institutes of this kind in Latin America will at the same time be strengthened and contributions will be made to the exchange and advancement of technological knowledge."

Chapter V of the declaration, which deals with educational, technological, and scientific development programs, is a laudable model for other multinational, cooperative educational programs in the near future.

In May, following Punta del Este, the Inter-American Cultural Council of the Organization of American States met and appointed a panel of distinguished scientists and a committee on education from member states to plan the programs to be undertaken as outlined by the American Presidents. Thus the groundwork is being laid for the execution of plans to raise the level of science and education in Latin America in a way and to a level unprecedented in history. It would be a pity if, at the very time the United States has committed itself to further educational and scientific development in Latin America, the necessary funds were not forthcoming,

especially since these programs are to be financed by all the nations concerned.

#### New Directions in CU

In the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State, under the leadership of Assistant Secretary Charles Frankel, significant new initiatives were undertaken and there was a redirection of existing programs within the overall context of U. S. foreign policy. It is clear today that education is a major key to world industrial development and political and social modernization, goals toward which U. S. foreign policy is firmly committed. The advancement of education, in this country as well as overseas, in the developed as well as in the less developed states, is now part of the normal conduct of our foreign relations.

Recognizing that educational programs form a vital arm of diplomacy, we are pleased to note the broad policy directives and redefinitions which were outlined by the Assistant Secretary. The new directives, today more than ever before, present the possibility of a total educational effort, using combined domestic and foreign resources for programs developed through cooperative long-range planning by American and foreign educators.

We note with keen interest the basic guidelines which the Department has adopted for executing its educational exchange programs. These guidelines, as enunciated in Dr. Frankel's

letter of January 17, 1967, to Commission Chairman Homer D. Babbidge,<sup>1</sup> set forth explicitly a system of operations which we believe will help develop "durable relations of practical interdependence between the educational systems of other countries and our own."

We wish here to underscore our belief that the purposes of the United States are best furthered by the practical interlacing of educational systems, by enlarging our intellectual dialog with scholars abroad, and by contributing to educational development at home and overseas, as defined in the Assistant Secretary's letter.

Long-Range Planning. Proceeding within these guidelines, the Department has begun careful binational planning--on a country-by-country basis--of educational exchange programs most appropriate to each country. During this past year teams of American scholars have been sent by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs to a number of countries to work with their counterparts on plans for educational programs over the next 5-10 years. Such long-range planning teams have already gone to Brazil, Peru, Finland, Yugoslavia, Thailand, and the Philippines. It is planned to send more such teams to other countries in the second year. It is too early to assess the results of such planning, but the American academic community is, generally agreed on its desirability.

---

1. For Dr. Frankel's letter, see Appendix 1.

Selection of Grantees. Basic, of course, to the success of all programs is the quality of the participants.

The Commission has noted with keen interest the many steps that are being taken to improve the selection of grantees. It especially commends the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs for expanding the dialog on this subject with the academic world. For many years the Committee on International Exchange of Persons of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils<sup>2</sup> has been the chief agent for nominating to the Board of Foreign Scholarships research scholars and lecturers to go overseas under the academic exchange programs. Assistant Secretary Frankel engaged the interest of the presidents of these councils to direct the attention of their constituents, which include practically all the learned societies of the United States, to the problem of improving the quality of Americans going overseas under Government auspices. We find this effort particularly gratifying because one of the chief recommendations in our first annual report (A Beacon of Hope), published in 1963, was that steps be taken to improve the quality of scholars and lecturers to be sent overseas.

Significantly, with the rise in the quality of participants and with the total effort now being exerted for educational purposes, a new and heightened interest has been generated in

---

2. American Council of Learned Societies, American Council on Education, National Research Council, and the Social Science Research Council.

much of the educational community of the United States and abroad. The new initiatives provide our best hope for establishing a firm base for cooperative binational and multinational associations. Ties between educators and educational institutions, among students, teachers, scholars, and artists of all countries, offer opportunities for maintaining relationships across national borders even when other access has been destroyed.

Improved Visa Procedures. Another positive action that grew out of the international education message was the easing of restrictions on visas. The President asked the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to "explore ways to remove unnecessary hindrances in granting visas to persons invited from abroad" to attend international conferences held in this country. To do so would, of course, be essential in carrying out the President's directives for a series of seminars of representatives from every discipline and culture "to seek answers to the common problems of mankind."

The Secretary of State and the Attorney General did indeed work out a system whereby many of the hindrances referred to by the President were removed. Excerpts from the joint press release<sup>3</sup> announcing the new procedure follow:

"At present almost all persons invited from non-Communist countries are allowed to attend international conferences held in the United States. However,

---

3. Department of State press release 104, May 3, 1966.

those who have, at any time, been a member of a Communist or Communist-front organization are first denied a visa and then subjected to delays of up to six weeks while the Departments of State and Justice process an application for an individual waiver of the provision of law excluding all past or present Communists...

"Under the new procedure, upon receipt of the description of a proposed international conference, the Secretary of State may recommend to the Attorney General that the national interest requires a group waiver of the provision of law which would otherwise automatically exclude all persons invited to the conference who had at any time been associated with a Communist party...

"Visas will, of course, continue to be denied in any individual case in which there is reason to believe that a particular invitee's visit to the United States would be contrary to our national interest or might endanger the national security."

Approximately 425 persons have been admitted under these new procedures, up to June 30, 1967.

Interagency Coordination. As chairman of the interagency Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, Dr. Frankel brought together representatives of the Department of Defense, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, the United States Information Agency, and others as appropriate, to discuss and work jointly on matters of common interest and intragovernmental benefit.

The International Migration of Talent and Skills. One of the major problems which has concerned a number of Government agencies is the international migration of talent and skills--the "brain drain." Recognizing the public interest in this subject

from so many quarters--Congress, the press, foreign governments, the educational community at large--the Council has initiated extensive research to help put this problem in clearer perspective. The research conducted, the published papers and documents, and the testimony of Department officers have resulted in greater understanding of this difficult problem. These studies have served to define and clarify the problem in its various aspects and to propose possible remedies. In general, the studies indicate that U. S. legislative action is not needed, but that there are other remedial steps that can and should be taken, especially with reference to the developing countries. The Commission's interest in this subject is referred to below.

International Book Programs. Under the interagency Council, Assistant Secretary Frankel established an Interagency Book Committee to serve as a central point in Government to receive the suggestions of the Government Advisory Committee on International Book and Library Programs (GAC), a public advisory group. This new Committee now makes it possible for the Government to respond promptly and effectively to the proposals of the GAC for improving U. S. overseas book and library programs. The two committees worked closely together in drafting a national policy statement on international book and library activities, which was issued as a Presidential Memorandum in January 1967. This declaration made clear and explicit the national



interest in international book and library activities.<sup>4</sup>

The Commission is pleased to note, in connection with the President's call for a freer flow of books and informational materials overseas, that in 1966 Congress passed legislation authorizing the United States to adhere to the Beirut and Florence Agreements--relating to books and audiovisual and other informational materials. The Commission wishes to commend all who played a part in completing this long-delayed legislation--enabling the United States to join with other nations in affirming the principle of "free trade" in educational and cultural materials.

We regret, however, that the Informational Media Guaranty Program has been allowed to expire. While not a "free trade" program, it has enabled certain countries to import American informational and educational materials which they would pay for with nonconvertible currencies. These were countries where the foreign exchange reserves would not permit dollar payments. Despite the recognized value of the program, Congress declined to pass legislation which would continue it.

English Language Teaching. Another significant development during the past several years has been the work of the Interagency Committee on English Language Teaching, another committee of the Interagency Council. This committee developed the U. S. Government policy statement on English language teaching abroad, which resulted

---

4. See Appendix 2 for statement on the activities of the Government Advisory Committee, together with the text of the national policy statement.

in further improvements in and some expansion of the English language teaching of all Government agencies concerned.<sup>5</sup> There are now clear directives to improve and expand programs in English language teaching abroad where we are invited to do so. In line with the policy statement, cooperation with the British Council has been developed.

#### Commission Activities

Membership. The terms of office of two members of the Commission have recently expired, namely, Roy E. Larsen, Chairman of the Executive Committee of Time, Inc., and Walter Johnson, professor of history at the University of Hawaii. In their places the President appointed Dr. Abram Sachar, president of Brandeis University, and Dr. Robert Scalapino, professor of political science at the University of California at Berkeley. In addition, the President reappointed Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., president of the University of Connecticut, to a 3-year term on the Commission and appointed Dr. Joseph R. Smiley, president of the University of Colorado, as chairman.

Liaison With Other Advisory Groups. In order that the Commission may be informed on the various Government programs in international educational and cultural affairs, certain of its members also serve on other advisory groups. Dr. Smiley has for the past year been a member of the Government Advisory

---

5. For text of national policy statement, see Appendix 3.

Committee on International Book and Library Programs. He also served as a member of the U. S. delegation to the 14th General Conference of UNESCO in the autumn of 1966.

Mr. Larsen served also on the National Review Board for the East-West Center and as Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the Arts. Dr. Luther Foster is a member of the General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs.

Conference on Brain Drain. In late summer the Commission co-sponsored--with the Centre de Recherches Europeennes of Lausanne, Switzerland--a conference in Lausanne on the subject of the brain drain. Dr. Walter Adams, an economist and a member of this Commission, took the responsibility for arranging this meeting with fellow economists from Western European nations and a number of developing countries. This was the first international conference to consider the brain drain from the economist's point of view and particularly as it affects developing countries. Basic papers and discussions focused on the economic factors to be given major consideration in looking for solutions to the problems of talent migration, particularly those in the developing world. The proceedings and papers on this conference will be published in early 1968.

Research and Publications. From its inception, the Commission has made research and publication a major activity. Our first annual report A Beacon of Hope has been distributed in some 32,000

copies; its sequel, our second annual report, has also had wide circulation and continues to be requested along with its predecessor. We see the annual report not only as a legislative requirement but also as a major means of informing the executive and legislative branches and the public at large, both at home and abroad, of these programs and other educational and cultural exchange activities.

In the past the Commission has made--or authorized its individual members to make--a number of special studies. These include:

American Studies Abroad, by Professor Walter Johnson of the Commission (1963)

A Report on the Strategic Importance of Western Europe, by Professor Walter Adams of the Commission (1964)

Open Hearts Open Minds, a report dealing with voluntary community services to international visitors (1966)

Foreign Students in the United States: A National Survey (1966)

Government, the Universities, and International Affairs: A Crisis in Identity, by Professor Walter Adams of Michigan State University and Professor Adrian Jaffe of Hamilton College

Significant among the Commission's undertakings is the publication of its quarterly International Educational and Cultural Exchange, now in its third year. It serves as a forum for the discussion of the most pressing issues in the field of educational and cultural exchange and for the expression of divergent views in this broad area. Exchange has been well received both here and abroad. A post-card survey of the readership, conducted after the

publication's first two years, revealed that more than three out of four recipients wished to be retained on the mailing list. The Commission looks at Exchange now as an established and effective medium for describing United States program activities and also for discussing general developments--non-governmental as well as governmental--in this field.

Two of the most important tasks the Commission has performed during its existence were undertaken at the request of the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs. They were both done by Commission member Roy E. Larsen and an associate.<sup>6</sup> The first was a survey of the Cultural Presentations Program of the Department which resulted in an overhauling of that program and in a reconstitution of the Advisory Committee on the Arts. The second survey concerned the East-West Center in Honolulu and resulted, among other things, in the establishment of a National Review Board for the East-West Center.<sup>7</sup>

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

##### A Quasi-Public Mechanism

Chief among the concerns of this Commission is the maintenance of the integrity of the educational and cultural exchange programs of the U. S. Government. This Commission feels strongly that the effectiveness of international educational and cultural relationships within the context of this nation's foreign policy depends upon free and open exchange.

The Commission, like most of the educational community of the United States, was shocked by the revelation of the involvement of

---

6. Glenn A. Wolfe worked with Mr. Larsen on the Cultural Presentations survey; James M. Davis was coauthor of the East-West Center study.  
7. For text of the Board's first report, see Appendix 4.

the Central Intelligence Agency in exchange activities conducted by nongovernmental organizations. Government assistance to these organizations could and should have been given overtly.

These revelations in turn raised a question about another aspect of exchange activities - the fact that the agency (USIA) which administers educational and cultural exchanges overseas also administers information programs. We hasten to add that any responsible citizen must recognize the need for an intelligence-gathering operation in our modern society and a similar need for an apparatus to explain American foreign policy overseas. But both of these instrumentalities should be meticulously separated from educational and cultural exchange programs. The major purpose of exchange programs - the increase of mutual understanding among all peoples - cannot be served if exchange activities are linked with those of information, as they now are, or with intelligence collection.

The Commission again urges, as it did in its letters of May 4, 1967, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to Secretary of State Rusk,<sup>8</sup> that the Rusk Committee -- together with the Congress and the highest officers of the executive branch - "examine critically the recommendations for establishing a quasi-public mechanism to remove educational and cultural programs a step or two from the Government."

---

8. For text of letters, see Appendixes 5 and 6.

In May of this year the Commission sent to the Congress a special report entitled Government, the Universities, and International Affairs: A Crisis in Identity, written by Professors Adams and Jaffe.

In transmitting this report, the Commission noted that international educational and cultural programs are "likely to be embarrassed and compromised when they are too closely and visibly associated with programs of propaganda and information." While recognizing that the latter programs are neither wrong nor unimportant to the nation, the Commission added that "just as educational and cultural programs must be divorced from any taint of their use as instruments of intelligence, by the same token they must be divorced from programs devoted solely to information and propaganda."

Education Officers. The Commission commends the Department for the spirit with which the new initiatives in international educational affairs have been undertaken and for the drive toward a total educational effort in its foreign affairs functions. We must, however, deplore the fact that it has not been possible to appoint the Education Officers in key embassies overseas recommended by President Johnson in his message to Congress on February 2, 1966. The Commission feels strongly that the total educational effort, so carefully planned, will be retarded unless officers who would report only to the Ambassador, and through him, to the Department, are present overseas to devote full time to educational activities, without the encumbrance of other responsibilities and pressures.

We believe the authorization of Education Officers needs prompt action by the Congress.<sup>9</sup> Education Officers are an essential element for carrying out the programs as currently conceived.

The Commission believes that serious misunderstanding of the functions of an Education Officer has led the Congress to table action. If the educational and cultural effort of the United States is to be successful overseas, the Government must have a complete picture of the educational systems of the countries with which it relates. The Government must have an officer who understands and represents the current dynamic movements of the U. S. educational system. Such an officer must be able to deal with scholars and educators in their own terms. He must, through experience and contact with the American academic community, be fully apprised of developments on the American educational scene. He must, above all, be responsive, through the Ambassador, to the Department's broad objectives through educational relations, and should be able to apply his experience and ability exclusively to such relations.

#### Funding Crisis

In order to resolve the very serious "funding crisis" that now exists in the field of international education, the Commission most strongly recommends that the Congress appropriate funds needed to implement the International Education Act of 1966. If this is not soon accomplished, the great momentum developed by the

---

9. For text of letter to the Congress on this subject, see Appendix 7.



President's Smithsonian address and his message of February 1966 to the Congress will surely run out.

The Commission once more repeats its concerns about the declining budget of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State.

As noted above, it seems ironic that programs so successful as those of the Bureau should continually suffer from what we referred to in our first annual report as "fiscal starvation." Thus, despite the innumerable demands on the public purse, we urge provision of sufficient funds to carry out these programs - which produce such great returns for so little expenditure.



## A P P E N D I X E S

1. Letter of January 17, 1967, from Assistant Secretary Charles Frankel to the Chairman of the Advisory Commission, Homer D. Babbidge, Jr.
2. Statement on activities of the Government Advisory Committee on International Book and Library Programs, together with text of the national policy statement.
3. Policy statement on English language teaching abroad.
4. First report of the National Review Board for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, February 1965-67.
5. Letter of May 4, 1967, from the Chairman of the Commission to Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, President of the Senate.
6. Letter of May 4, 1967, from the Chairman of the Commission to Secretary of State Dean Rusk.
7. Letter of May 4, 1967, from the Chairman of the Commission to Vice President Humphrey.

## APPENDIX NO. 1

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE  
WASHINGTON

January 17, 1967

Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr.  
President, University of Connecticut  
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Dear Homer:

I am sorry that the UNESCO Conference in Paris prevented my being with you at the last meeting of the Advisory Commission. It is too bad I could not be in two places at once, since I wanted the Commission's counsel.

Fortunately, my colleagues promised at this meeting that I would send you an outline of CU's "Emerging Design" -- a description of the new directions in which we wish to move and the policy that governs these changes. I think that such a statement may promote the exchange of views on fundamental matters which I am seeking at this time with the members of the Advisory Commission.

We are at present engaged in a thorough review of the whole pattern of CU activities. We have set ourselves certain long-range objectives and are remodeling our programs so that they will serve these objectives systematically. They are not objectives, I believe, which depart in spirit from those that have guided CU in the past. However, they stem from an effort to clarify some purposes that have been vague and others that have been implicit and sometimes overlooked. They are stated, furthermore, in a new form -- in terms that will reflect the dynamics of this decade and will help us, I hope, to be more deliberately successful in translating theory into practice.

First, we wish to use the exchange program to help develop durable relations of practical interdependence between the educational systems of other countries and our own. We are trying to think, in other words, in institutional terms rather than in simply individual terms. Exchanges, we think, should be so planned and programmed that key people, key departments of study or key educational institutions, here and abroad, will be joined together in a web of relationships that will endure. The prime way to build international understanding systematically, I believe, is to develop practical working relationships between educational institutions that will give these institutions themselves international affiliations, an international atmosphere, and an international perspective.

Instead of concentrating as extensively as we have in the past on short-term ad hoc exchanges, we will deliberately encourage more institutional relationships of which exchange professors, teachers and scholars may be a continuing part. These relationships may be

institution-to-institution, or department-to-department, or institution-to-department. They may involve mutual curriculum planning and development of teaching materials, and even exchange of materials. It is our hope that many of these relationships will be privately arranged, though CU will also encourage them through formal contracts and affiliations, and offer such "go-between" assistance and related individual exchange grants as desirable and possible. The aim is to maintain and fructify over a period of time not only a dynamic partnership but a continuum to which the individual grantees can relate themselves. We can thus not only extend over a period of time the effectiveness of the exchange program but of the individual exchange teacher, professor or scholar.

This does not mean that we ignore the value to our program of talented individuals, apart from fields of study, professional associations, or institutional relationships. We do not propose to eliminate grants to individuals. We propose, however, to devote increasing portions of our exchange program to the accomplishment of definite and selected goals in given countries that will contribute to the practical interlacing of their educational systems with our own. We believe that this new approach will not militate against the talented individual and may help attract him; and, of course, we shall always leave room for the good man who does not fit a prescribed plan.

Second, we want to use the exchange program to develop and sustain a larger and more disciplined discourse among academic people and intellectual and cultural leaders, American and foreign. The development of a shared vocabulary, of common approaches to intellectual problems, and of clearer and more precise communication -- these are what is meant, in day-to-day practice, by mutual understanding among intellectual leaders.

Such understanding among intellectual leaders does not imply agreement on all matters; nor are its benefits restricted to them alone. Such discourse has as its ultimate purpose the improvement of understanding among ordinary people of the world and the advancement of their education. But we believe this cannot be achieved unless intellectual leaders and professional teachers and scholars are affirmatively disposed towards the idea of intellectual community and are themselves leading the way in their own professional work and practical actions.

As part of this effort, we are proceeding to develop more systematically than heretofore opportunities and settings for the exchange of ideas among intellectual leaders. This includes, as a most important feature, support for such international meetings as President Johnson called for in his Smithsonian Address of September, 1965. We are working to encourage such meetings through CU's programs, and also

in our function as Government-wide policy guide and leader, by stimulating other agencies of the Government. We are also inviting the attention of the private educational community and of international governmental and non-governmental organizations to the importance of this kind of endeavor.

The coming World Conference on Education, which was announced by the President during his visit to Hawaii, is one example of such meetings. However, the effort to develop and sustain a disciplined and genuinely responsive international dialogue among educators and cultural leaders is not restricted to the effort to encourage international meetings on common human problems. In each country and area, we have to determine what particular sort of effort is most worth our concentrated attention. In some areas of the world, it calls for efforts to enhance the visibility and recognition of the social sciences, which represent an extraordinary American intellectual resource, and which have a still untapped potential as an instrument for more dispassionate and objective international discourse. In other areas of the world, it calls for a systematic effort to improve the quality of Americans who are selected for cooperative educational and cultural endeavors.

Third, we wish, through our programs, to contribute to educational development at home as well as abroad, and in the developed countries as well as in the emerging nations. We hope to encourage other agencies of the Government to pursue the same objective intensively.

This third objective is more than the enunciation of a United States policy that has been stated many times before. It represents a new point of view and not simply a new emphasis on old goals. By "education" we mean education in a broad sense; by "development" we mean more than the limited economic and technical changes that have conventionally, and mistakenly, been taken to be all that the word designates.

In the course of formal assistance program overseas, "development" of education has often in the past taken on a "project-oriented" meaning. "Education" has frequently been interpreted as closer to "training", and therefore to the "hardware" aspects of technical assistance, than to education in the large sense. Some of our CU exchange programs in the education field have also taken on this emphasis on "training" and on methodology, pedagogy. The new focus of our efforts in CU, both here and abroad, will be the development, the enhancement of the whole reach of education, its character, quality and aims.

It is in this area that some of the most important explorations between CU and HEW will take place, as to our relative roles. Our role in teacher exchange is a case in point. We in CU, as we speak

of our part in educational development, are no longer convinced that methodology, pedagogy is our proper purpose in teacher exchange. We are groping toward a formula for teacher exchange that will have impact on teachers as members of an international environment, and give a larger view to their classrooms and instruction, whether they teach chemistry, English or world history.

The immediate environment or mechanism for exchange teachers may be the foreign classroom, association with pupils, teachers and parents of another culture. But CU's proper purpose is to broaden the teacher's horizons, to create awareness of and insights into the infinite variety and complexity of other peoples and their cultures. Teachers who have gained this awareness will in the true sense "develop" education, "internationalize" education, whether here or abroad.

Development of education both here and overseas, also means, as I see it, development of curricula -- an "internationalization" of curricula if you will. Here too CU's role is important. I do not mean here simply aiding Asian Studies or African Studies -- or American Studies. I mean internationalizing the point of view, the world perspective on studies in the regular curricula -- on economics, government, even on U. S. history or literature!

Let me illustrate by referring to American Studies which CU, as well as private educational agencies in the U.S., has actively fostered abroad over the past dozen years or so. In many countries, such studies have taken strong root, and many permanent chairs in American Studies, and even American Studies associations, have been established.

In some countries, however, as you know, American professors have frequently gone out as lecturers in U. S. history or civilization where their course has no relation to the overall curriculum as a whole or even to the department in which they lectured. In a new hard look at American Studies, we are considering a change in the former practice of sending professors out to teach isolated courses. We hope to find ways in which American Studies can be incorporated within the definable disciplines, so that they strike roots in established departments and lead to the inclusion of American materials in basic programs of study.

I hope very much the same kind of thing can happen to curricula here, so that Asian or African or Latin American materials are not only given in separate studies, but are also incorporated into the basic disciplines taught in American schools and colleges.

You can see, I think, from the initiatives outlined here that the advice of the Advisory Commission is of great importance to CU at this time.

These are some of the particular problems on which we need your counsel:

1. What in your view are some of the "common problems of mankind" which are appropriate and urgent issues for international conferences, seminars and a continuing dialog?
2. In our effort to develop close relationships with the international academic community, what kind of tie would be most meaningful and fruitful between U. S. and foreign institutions?
3. In our objective to develop education here and abroad, what is the proper relation of CU functions to those of HEW under its new mandate to strengthen U. S. education in international studies? It is not enough to say, I think, that whatever helps American education belongs to HEW. While our officers are meeting frequently with those of HEW, I believe that this Advisory Commission, and the National Advisory Committee on International Studies, which is to be appointed under the new International Education Act, should meet at the earliest opportunity to advise both CU and HEW on the proper boundaries for our activities.)
4. Similarly, what role should CU take in the development of education abroad, both in those countries where AID is now operating, and those from which it has withdrawn? What role should it take in the advanced countries?
5. It is quite clear that to achieve success in our new initiatives, quality in exchange is imperative. None of us is satisfied -- many of us are acutely dissatisfied -- with the quality of some of our grantees. What measures can be taken to assure the necessary quality of grantees?
6. If these new initiatives are to be carried out, a fresh look is necessary at the levels of exchange on which CU should concentrate. For example, should CU support exchange of teen-agers? Or, to what extent should CU support students as against research scholars? Or bring "young leaders" or so-called "educational travel" groups of young people to the U. S. as against high-level lecturers, intellectuals and scholars?

These then are some of the problems -- there are many others -- we are currently working on within CU. I appreciate this opportunity to share them with you. I look forward to discussing them with you at the Commission's January meeting.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Frankel



## APPENDIX NO. 2

GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL BOOK  
AND LIBRARY PROGRAMS

1962 - 1967

The Government Advisory Committee on International Book and Library Programs was established in October 1962 by the Secretary of State under the authority of P.L. 87-256, but does not itself have a channel of communication to the Congress except through the Advisory Commission. The Committee's membership originally consisted of 12 publishers representing the various branches of the publishing industry, but in October 1966 three of the publisher members were replaced by two educators and a librarian, one of the educators being also a member of the Advisory Commission. This action improved coordination between the Committee and the Commission and, by giving increased attention to books as instruments of education and enlarging the scope of the Committee to include library as well as book activities, sought to make it more responsive to the President's new initiatives in education, as enunciated in his Smithsonian address and his message to Congress of February 2, 1967.

The Committee watched with considerable interest the passage of the International Education Act in October of last year, but like other advisory groups deplored the lack of funding for the activities originally envisaged.

The Committee also became greatly concerned, as did many persons in the academic and publishing world, with the revelations early this spring of the involvement of the Central Intelligence Agency in various overseas educational programs. The Committee supported in a letter to Secretary Rusk the idea of establishing

a public-private mechanism to operate eventually all of this Government's international educational and cultural programs. The Committee's main concern, of course, since its members are largely publishers, had to do with the credibility of American publications overseas, which the group felt was compromised once it was revealed that a variety of educational activities overseas were funded by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Since its creation, the Committee has reviewed all the major book programs conducted by Government agencies overseas, offering advice which has resulted in improved coordination and efficiency. At the request of interested Government agencies, it has established ad hoc panels to study such matters as: the Government's book-programs in Latin America, means for increasing overseas distribution of American scientific and technical books, textbook needs and marketing problems in the U.A.R., the effect of the rupee devaluation on the availability of American books in India, the nature of the American library presence overseas and what its goals should be, and the kind of textbook program that should be conducted by the Government overseas.

In the Committee's view, its greatest single achievement has been the part it played in formulating the national policy statement on international book and library activities and the implementing directive, that were approved by the President in January 1967. The Committee made a substantial contribution to both these documents, with all its suggestions being incorporated in the final versions.

Perhaps the Committee's greatest value has been in the improvement of coordination, not only between the Government and the book industry and library profession, but also between the Government and multilateral organizations, notably UNESCO and the OAS, and among the various Government agencies.

The Department of State responded to the Committee's recommendations for greater coordination in Government programs by creating, in July 1966, an Interagency Book Committee under the Interagency Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. This Committee, which is chaired by the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs and consists of representatives from AID, HEW, the Library of Congress, the Peace Corps, the Smithsonian Institution, and USIA, provides a central place within the Government to coordinate action upon the Advisory Committee's advice.

## NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT ON INTERNATIONAL BOOK AND LIBRARY ACTIVITIES

In his message to Congress of February 2, 1966, the President said, "Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes. It must be at the heart of our international relations." Books, by definition, are essential to education and to the achievement of literacy. They are also essential to communication and understanding among the peoples of the world. It is through books that people communicate in the most lasting form their beliefs, aspirations, cultural achievements, and scientific and technical knowledge.

In the United States and other developed countries, where there has been the opportunity for a long time to emphasize education and books, there have been created vast resources of printed materials and other forms of recorded knowledge in all fields of human endeavor. In the United States, a great complex of library systems has emerged, serving ordinary citizens as well as students and scholars. In the developing countries, where more than two-thirds of the world's population live, there is an acute need for the books essential to educational growth and general social progress, and for libraries which can enable these nations more easily to acquire and use the technology of the modern world. The United States Government declares that it is prepared, as a major policy, to give full and vigorous support to a coordinated effort of public and private organizations which will make more available to the developing countries those book and library resources of the United States which these countries need and desire.

The total needs of the developing countries with regard to books cannot be adequately filled by assistance from the outside; nor, under present conditions, can they be filled from local resources. From a long-range point of view, the establishment of viable book publishing and distributing facilities in the developing countries and regions is essential. It shall therefore also be the policy of the United States Government to encourage and support the establishment of such facilities.

The utility of books goes beyond their contribution to material progress. The free and full exchange of ideas, experiences and information, through books, is indispensable to effective communication between people and nations, and has a unique role to play in the enrichment of the human spirit. Recognizing this, the United States Government is further prepared, as a major policy, actively to promote the free flow of books and other forms of recorded knowledge.

The task of filling the world's need for books and of achieving an adequate exchange of books among the nations is immense. No single

institution or agency and no single government can hope to accomplish it alone. It is therefore essential that all agencies of Government concerned in any way with international book and library programs assign to these a high priority. It is further essential that they coordinate their book and library efforts with those of other pertinent government agencies and private institutions. Agencies will propose to the President for transmittal to the Congress any requirements for new legislation or special funds to carry out this policy. All agencies of Government, under the direction of the Department of State, should actively seek to cooperate with other governments on a bilateral or multilateral basis in the achievement of these objectives.

The Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs has the responsibility for coordinating United States Government efforts in this field.

## APPENDIX NO. 3

POLICY STATEMENT ON  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING ABROAD

English has become one of the most important world languages. The rapidly growing interest in English cuts across political and ideological lines because of the convenience of a lingua franca increasingly used as a second language in important areas of the world. Demands for help in learning English are, therefore, widespread. The United States ought to respond to these demands. English is a key which opens doors to scientific and technical knowledge indispensable to the economic and political development of vast areas of the world. An increase in the knowledge of English can contribute directly to greater understanding among nations. It can also be the means of assuring access to a treasure house of man's knowledge about himself--about his political experiments, his philosophies, and his inner human needs.

The U. S. Government is prepared, as a major policy, to be of active and friendly assistance to countries that desire such help in the teaching and utilization of English. Each agency providing assistance to the teaching of English abroad under existing authorities will assign a higher priority to activities in this area, within the framework of its own resources and programs. If new legislation or special funds are needed to effect this policy, agencies will make appropriate requests to the Congress. The Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs has responsibility for coordinating U. S. Government efforts in this field.

## APPENDIX NO. 4

FIRST REPORT  
of the  
NATIONAL REVIEW BOARD  
for the  
CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST  
(East-West Center)

February 1965 - 1967

I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The National Review Board was established on February 24, 1965, under authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 and the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as a result of the recommendation of the U.S. Advisory Commission for International Educational and Cultural Affairs, based on the Larsen-Davis report of March, 1964. (See Appendix A). The Board's main responsibility is that of representing the national interest in East-West Center affairs.

The Center was established in 1960 "...to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific...through cooperative study, training and research..." The East-West Center awards scholarship grants for study mainly at the University of Hawaii. Financial support to the Center is provided through annual Congressional appropriations to the Department of State administered through its Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

The U.S. Advisory Commission at its May 23, 1966 meeting recommended that consideration be given to the desirability of transferring jurisdiction over the East-West Center's operations and activities from the Department of State to the proposed Center for Educational Cooperation in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The Review Board, however, suggested that consideration of this recommendation be deferred until such time as the Center for Educational Cooperation is actually established and has become fully operative.

II. SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES

The National Review Board (See Appendix B) held its first meeting, an organizational one, on May 13 and 14, 1965 in Washington, D.C. The Board's functions as set forth in its bylaws are to review the programs and operations of the East-West Center from the standpoint of the national interest and advise the Secretary of State with regard to these matters. In discharging these advisory responsibilities, the National Review Board:

- advises on general policies governing the operations of the Center
- advises on the annual budget of the Center
- considers requests from the Center for future capital construction
- advises on the coordination of the Center's programs with related educational and cultural programs between the United States and countries of Asia and the Pacific area, and
- appraises the effectiveness of programs carried out by the Center, its Institutes, and the EWC Press.

During the period of time covered by this report, the National Review Board, in addition to its May 1965 meeting, met in Honolulu on January 24-26, 1966; in Washington, July 11-12, 1966; and again in Honolulu, December 5-7, 1966. In addition, the Executive Committee of the Board met in Honolulu for an orientation meeting during September 11-16, 1965, and then held the following other meetings: In Washington on May 2-3 and September 29-30, 1966; and in New York, February 16-17, 1967.

### III. ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND PROGRESS

More than 2,000 students, trainees and specialists from 31 countries of Asia, the Pacific area and the United States participate in East-West Center programs each year. The Center is a major element in the U.S. Government's peace program in Asia, and its resources make it a logical point of implementation of key aspects of the President's program in the field of international education. Additional evidence of the recognition being accorded the Center's role may be noted in the fact that President Johnson, Vice President Humphrey and the President of the Philippines each chose the Center as the site of a major address; reports of Center activities have been publicized in the professional and public press; a vast increase in applications for EWC grants; financial contributions from outside sources; and requests for Center cooperation in research projects, conferences and seminars.

In implementing the task of reviewing the programs and operations of the East-West Center, the National Review Board wishes to report accomplishments and progress in the following critical areas of concern:

#### A. Finance

- 1) Budget - Consideration of the budget is one of the Board's most important functions. The Board is, therefore, pleased with the Center's improved budgetary reporting which followed the Board's initial



request for detailed information. The Board has supported the EWC budget requests and believes that its continued review of the East-West Center budget process is in the national interest. The Larsen-Davis report, which recommended the appointment of the National Review Board, also called attention to the need for long-term budgeting for an educational exchange program -- preferably three-year projection. In reviewing the budget the Board felt that a five-year budget for the Center would be more desirable since it could act as both a ceiling for commitments and advance expenditures and as a basis for planning and systematic growth.

Although the Larsen-Davis report recommended a gradual increase in scholarships and capital construction which would level out by 1970 at \$10.5 million, budget cut-backs necessitated by the abnormal expenditures in Southeast Asia have resulted in a lower level of support which precludes achievement of the goals as originally envisioned.

2) EWC Staff Salaries

At the request of the East-West Center, and with the approval of the Board, the Congress removed the salary ceiling which inhibited the recruitment and retention of top Center personnel. As regards a recent study of the Center's organization, position classification system and salary administration, the Board recommended that in implementing the study the Center take into account the compatibility of its salary scale to that of the University of Hawaii as well as that of the Federal Government. Salaries have been adjusted accordingly.

3) Other Financial Support

The Board was interested and concerned that the Center seek additional sources of funds. It is gratified to note that some cost-sharing agreements for technical trainees already exist and that the Center is seeking similar agreements for student grantees and private support for special projects.

Local foundations have made modest contributions to the Asian Directory and Asian Edition programs of the EWC press, while other sources have financed and jointly sponsored conferences, seminars and research projects.

## B. Programs

The Board believes it has been able to make useful contributions to the work of the Center by its continued interest in the quality of all grantees, the scope and content of the programs and the facilities necessary for the Center to perform its tasks successfully.

### 1) The Institutes

In all three Institutes - Student Interchange, Technical Interchange and Advanced Projects - new programs and developments were introduced which indicate the forward direction and momentum of the Center's operations. Included in these developments are: The Language Intern Program for Asian Teachers, the appointment of the EWC/UH Committee on Academic Programs, Shipboard Orientation Program for new Asian students; use of Hilo Campus of the University of Hawaii for Asian freshman and sophomore grantees. The Board has also recommended that there be increased participation by the IAP scholars in the programs and activities of the other institutes.

In addition, the Board was especially interested in improving the caliber of the U.S. grantee, through revision of recruitment and selection procedures, and giving preference to more mature students who had had work experience after college and before going into graduate work, such as Peace Corps workers.

### 2) The Library

The Board was deeply concerned over the deletion from the East-West Center budget for fiscal 1968 of the construction funds for the much-needed library, especially so since the planning money had been approved in the 1967 budget. The library has been a high priority goal since the inception of the Center. It is so vital to the quality operation of the Center that if there is no other way of obtaining the construction funds, the Board would recommend considering the drastic action of cutting the student grants in order to begin the financing of the library. The Board has received assurances from the Department of State, however, that the necessary funding will be included either as a fiscal year 1968 contingency fund or in the fiscal year 1969 budget request as soon as the planning session is completed.

3) East-West Center Press

The Board felt that there was need for a review and evaluation of the EWC Press operations and requested the Government Advisory Committee on International Book Programs to undertake the task. A subcommittee of three will report its findings to the Board when the survey is completed.

4) Five-Year Development Plan

The Board recommended that a space study be undertaken. A firm of consultants, which is also handling the University of Hawaii development program, has been employed to make recommendations on a short-term interim basis for solving the immediate space needs as well as to develop a long-range capital improvement program.

5) Five-Year Program Projection

An East-West Center/University of Hawaii Task Force was set up to consider the problem of projecting a five-year master program plan for the Center. Part I of its report, entitled A Basis for a Five-Year Program Projection, has been completed and submitted to a permanent Joint Commission on EWC/UH Affairs. This Commission has the responsibility to coordinate plans and operations between the two institutions. Part II of this study will deal with specific curricula and programs. Part III will deal with costs.

C. Administration

The East-West Center is a unique institution in that it was established with the main purpose of promoting through interchange mutual understanding and cooperation among the countries of the Asian-Pacific area and the United States.

1) Relations with the University of Hawaii

The Board has directed constant attention to the subject of cooperation between the Center, which administers the grants, and the University of Hawaii, which provides formal education to the student and the granting of degrees. The Board recognizes that the East-West Center is a unique organizational hybrid that will succeed in proportion to its ability to develop good working relations with the University.

The East-West Center is earning identity in educational and governmental circles of the Asian-Pacific area. We believe that as an increasing number of alumni move into

productive and influential positions of leadership in Asia, their East-West Center experiences will have a real impact in providing trained manpower for meeting specific country needs and in the betterment of international understanding. The Board therefore believes that the Center should be continued as a separate and identifiable entity. In this connection, it should be emphasized that the University of Hawaii also recognizes the increasing importance and stimulation that the East-West Center has given to the University.

2) Board of Regents - University of Hawaii

The National Review Board recognizes that there is a cooperating responsibility between the Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii and the National Review Board for the furthering of the Center's programs. More frequent contacts between the two boards have been recommended. Arrangements have been proposed to assure that the Board of Regents' views on budgetary matters will be brought to the attention of the National Review Board.

3) EWG Staff

Steps have been taken to strengthen the Center's top staff. The lifting of the salary ceiling has greatly assisted in the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel. Initial appointments have been made in the newly created positions of Deputy Chancellor for Administration, Deputy Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Special Assistant to the Chancellor.

Ambassador Howard P. Jones was appointed Chancellor of the East-West Center as of July 1965. In the short time he has been in command his understanding of Asian-American affairs has been of great assistance to the Center. He has been successful in coordinating the activities of the various Institutes and in bringing about an effective internal organization, establishing good relations with the University of Hawaii, and enhancing the prestige of the Center. At the same time, he has been exceptionally cooperative with the Review Board. The members of the Board will lend their continued strong support to him in the coming months in his task of achieving international understanding through educational interchange.

Appendix A

U. S. ADVISORY COMMISSION SURVEY OF THE EAST-WEST CENTER  
(Larsen-Davis Report)  
Summary Recommendations

The Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West was established under authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1960, "...to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific ... through cooperative study, training and research..." and is administered by the Department of State. Congressional concern as to whether the Department were exercising sufficient control over the East-West Center, resulted in a survey conducted by the U.S. Advisory Commission and the submission in March 1964 of the Larsen-Davis Report, which recommended that:

- (1) The present relationship between the East-West Center and the University of Hawaii be maintained, except that the Chancellor of the East-West Center should be under the administrative responsibility of the President of the University of Hawaii.
- (2) A national advisory and review body of eleven members be appointed to be known as the National Review Board to represent the national interest and review the programs and operations of the East-West Center, and have as its Chairman the Governor of Hawaii.
- (3) The Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs designate an officer to assist him in the fulfillment of functions delegated to him by the Secretary of State relating to the East-West Center.
- (4) The International Panel of Advisers, appointed for two years in 1962 and composed of nine members who hold positions of leadership in five countries, be continued.
- (5) The Chancellor appoint a Deputy Chancellor to serve as coordinator of operations and program planning for the Center.
- (6) The budgets of the East-West Center be based on a plan of orderly growth, preferably on a three-year projection, which would act as both a ceiling on commitments for advance expenditures and as a basis for planning. For the three years 1965-67 a total of \$25.5 million, including \$4.3 for capital construction, was recommended with an annual commitment of \$10.5 million beginning with 1970.

Appendix B

NATIONAL REVIEW BOARD  
for the  
East-West Center

John A. Burns (Chairman)  
Governor of Hawaii

Hugh Borton  
President  
Haverford College

Hung Wo Ching  
Chairman, Board of Directors  
Aloha Airlines, Inc.

Charles Frankel  
Assistant Secretary of State

Francis E. Keppel  
Chairman, Board of Directors  
General Learning Corporation

Roy E. Larsen  
Chairman, Executive Committee  
Time, Incorporated

Mrs. Mary W. Lasker  
President  
Albert & Mary Lasker Foundation

Reverend Laurence J. McGinley, S.J.  
Vice President  
Saint Peter's College  
(Vice Chairman - NRB)

Otto N. Miller  
President  
Standard Oil Company of California

Logan Wilson  
President  
American Council on Education

---

Secretariat: James A. Donovan, jr., Staff Director  
Mary Tsouvalas, Executive Secretary  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

APPENDIX NO. 5



THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION  
ON  
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20520

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

President's Office  
University of Connecticut  
Storrs, Connecticut

May 4, 1967

The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey  
President of the Senate  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Vice President:\*

This Commission has been shocked by the recent revelations regarding the Central Intelligence Agency's covert support of certain international educational programs. Like many persons in institutions in the academic world and among the general public, the Commission believes that enormous damage has been done to well established government programs of international educational and cultural exchange. Further, the motives of many Americans traveling abroad and even of foreign students and visitors to this country are now suspect. Individuals motivated by a "holy curiosity" to engage in projects of unquestioned academic integrity may be regarded by their fellow citizens or their hosts abroad as somehow the agents, and their projects viewed as creatures, of an American espionage apparatus.

Nevertheless, the Commission believes that the damage, though immeasurable, is not irreparable. The rallying of forces in and out of government to certify to the integrity of the overt government educational and cultural programs has been most heartening. The appointment by the President of the distinguished group under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary of State, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, to examine the revelations was an important first step. This Commission accepts the fact that many of the covert activities were undoubtedly useful to the execution of American foreign policy. It is enormously ironic, however, that legislation and carefully considered plans already existed to do openly what the Central Intelligence Agency did secretly, but were never fully utilized, primarily because of the "fiscal starvation" of the Department of State's international educational and cultural programs. This Commission took note of this situation in its first annual report to Congress in 1963.

In the aftermath of the revelations of the CIA activities, a number of bills and one resolution have been introduced into the Congress. They provide generally that some way be found to render financial assistance to students and other groups and associations

\* Identical letter sent also to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Hubert H. Humphrey

May 4, 1967

to aid them in the promotion of international understanding or to provide private participation for American students and others in international organizations and movements. We note that authority for much of this activity already exists in the Fulbright-Hays Act (PL 87-256).

We are convinced that a basic problem is one of funding and that existing authorities are not wholly effective because of a lack of funds. We are also convinced, however, that these programs do not need just money or just new legislation. The simple availability of adequate funds or even new authority which might be attained in new legislation would not of themselves solve all of the problems in this field as we see them. What is needed is much greater visibility of these programs, and we welcome the opportunity provided by the report of the Katzenbach panel to put down some of our thoughts on this subject.

Indeed, the revelations of the CIA's covert activities raised again another question in our minds with regard to the integrity of the government's educational and cultural programs abroad. This has to do with the separation of programs for educational and cultural exchange and for mutual understanding from programs for information and propaganda.

We hasten to add that any responsible citizen must recognize a need for an intelligence-gathering operation in our modern society and a similar need for an apparatus to explain American foreign policy overseas -- both in its day-to-day operation and its long-range effects. Nevertheless, both of these instrumentalities should be meticulously separated from educational and cultural exchange programs, public and private.

The President has established a committee of distinguished persons in the executive and legislative branches and from private life, to consider action to be taken on the recommendations of the Katzenbach panel. We urge that this committee -- together with the Congress and the highest offices of the executive branch -- examine critically the recommendations for establishing a quasi-public mechanism to remove educational and cultural programs a step or two from the Government.

The panel suggested that a model for such a mechanism might be found in the British Council, the Swedish Institute for Cultural Relations, or the Indian Council for Cultural Relations. Surely the work of these organizations should be considered, but we suggest that the Canada Council might be a better pattern for our use. This group, which has been in existence for ten years, provides, among other things, support to Canadian universities. It also operates the Canadian government's educational and cultural programs overseas. While our problems in this field undoubtedly differ in degree from those of our neighbor to the north, they are not different in kind.



Hubert H. Humphrey

May 4, 1967

In any case, we believe that the quasi-public mechanism might combine the functions of the Center for Educational Cooperation, which is to be established in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of HEW for Education, the functions of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State, and the genuine educational and cultural aspects of the United States Information Agency, such as its libraries and English language teaching programs. If to put these functions in one quasi-public institution means a thorough overhaul of the United States Information Agency and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, their relationship in Washington, the administrative mechanism by which the USIS operates the Department's educational and cultural programs overseas, the career service of the USIA and the Department of State, the government should not shrink from such a task. The potentiality for improved efficiency and the separation of educational and cultural programs from those of propaganda or intelligence-gathering seem to us to have so great an appeal that they warrant the careful consideration of the Congress of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

Homer D. Babbidge, Jr.  
Chairman

APPENDIX NO. 6



THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION  
ON  
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20520

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

President's Office  
University of Connecticut  
Storrs, Connecticut

May 4, 1967

The Honorable Dean Rusk  
Secretary of State  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The recent disclosures about the involvement of the Central Intelligence Agency in international educational and cultural programs came as a surprise and shock to the members of this Commission, as indeed they did to large numbers of the academic community and the general public.

It is our belief that incalculable damage was done by the concealed subsidies of the CIA to American participants in those programs. Questions have now been raised in the minds of foreign scholars, intellectuals, and artists about the objectivity, integrity, and independence of American foundations and the role of any U. S. citizen abroad. Even persons connected with private institutions, to say nothing of those having overt government grants, have been tainted as possible agents of the American intelligence community.

It is ironic that an intelligence agency, working covertly, found it in the national interest to engage in programs which this Commission has always underscored as a vital instrument of foreign policy. In our annual and special reports we have long urged an increase in the size and an improvement in the quality of the U. S. government's international educational and cultural programs. We have stated repeatedly, however, that only programs of academic validity and unquestioned integrity can achieve the purpose for which they are intended, namely, the promotion of mutual understanding and the elimination of national stereotypes.

The Commission is pleased to note that many people in and out of government have recognized that, as a result of the revelations of CIA's activities, the time is now ripe for decisive action and a great step forward toward the proper support of present and ongoing programs.

Secretary Rusk

May 4, 1967

We write to you in your capacity as chairman of the committee set up by the President to consider the implications of the reports of the panel chaired by Under Secretary Katzenbach. The panel's suggestion that consideration be given to establishing a quasi-public organization to become the main vehicle of educational and cultural exchange of this government is surely a stride in the right direction. In addition to the models proposed by the Katzenbach panel we suggest that consideration also be given to the admirable Canada Council, then hope that the executive branch and the Congress will approve bold, comprehensive, and pervasive action.

If this Commission can be of assistance to you and your committee in the crucial tasks before you, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

Homer D. Babbidge, Jr.  
Chairman

## APPENDIX NO. 7



THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION  
ON  
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20520

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

President's Office  
University of Connecticut  
Storrs, Connecticut

May 4, 1967

The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey  
President of the Senate  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Vice President:\*

This Commission has noted with satisfaction the commitment of the executive branch to education and, more particularly in the past year and a half, to international educational programs. The President's speech in September of 1965 on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the birth of James Smithson, and his 1966 message accompanying the International Education Act were vigorous declarations of this commitment.

Passage of the act by the Congress in the last session was a welcome sign that the legislative branch, as well, understands the importance of internationalizing education in the United States. The new programs called for in the legislation and the President's message seem natural partners of those programs already going on which concern themselves with mutual understanding, technical assistance, and education generally. Such programs of the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, and the Peace Corps will ultimately benefit from the new ones in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, carried out under the International Education Act.

One feature of the President's message on the International Education Act which struck the members of the Commission as being of particular value was his proposal to "create a Corps of Education Officers to serve in the United States foreign service." If more attention is to be given to international education programs it is imperative that American ambassadors in the more important posts have at their disposal a man whose function is to act as a link between the educational community of this country and that of the countries overseas where he serves. Since the President now receives reports from the American embassies on labor, commerce, agriculture and military affairs, it is reasonable to expect him to have a means of receiving similar reports on educational programs overseas.

We urge the Congress, therefore, to appropriate the necessary funds for the creation of this corps of education officers.

Sincerely,

Homer D. Babbidge, Jr.  
Chairman

\* Identical letter sent also  
to the Speaker of the House  
of Representatives.

